

Approved from MHA

MAR. 29. 2006 6:47PM

STASS & HALSEY -202-434-1501

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER NO. 1656

P. 3/9

MAR 29 2006

MAA 5/2/06

Docket No.: 1875,1004 (formerly 121,1053)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:
Koichi SAKITA

Serial No. 10/634,830

Group Art Unit: 2821

Confirmation No. 8813

Filed: August 6, 2003

Examiner: A, MINH D

For: METHOD FOR DRIVING PLASMA DISPLAY PANEL

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND WITHDRAWAL OF FINAL REJECTION AS
PREMATURE UNDER MPEP 706.07-706(e) AND
RESPONSE**

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

INTRODUCTION

The Final Office Action mailed December 29, 2005 is submitted to be improper, since the Response filed September 19, 2005 to the first Office Action did not substantially amend any of the claims and, instead, merely made minor amendments to improve form and/or correct grammatical usage, etc. Hence, Applicants solely presented arguments in support of the patentability of the rejected claims over the references and rejections then of record - - and those arguments were successful in achieving the withdrawal of the rejection and the reference.

FURTHER BASIS OF DEFICIENCIES OF THE ACTION REQUIRING WITHDRAWAL OF SAME

The Final Action furthermore overlooks the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 2, 2005 and, thus, is incomplete and should be withdrawn and a new Action issued.

MPEP 609.05(b) specifies that the Examiner "must consider all citations submitted in conformance with the rules..." and the completed Form PTO-1449 "as reviewed by the Examiner will be returned to the Applicant with the next communication...."

As emphasized in MPEP 706.07:

before final rejection is in order a clear issue should be developed
between the examiner and applicant.